arXiv:1611.03978v2 [math.DS] 15 Nov 2016

ON THE ONE-WAY SPECIFICATION PROPERTY AND LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR NON-TRANSITIVE SYSTEMS

KENICHIRO YAMAMOTO

Abstract. We introduce a weaker form of the specification property, called "one-way specification property", and give several examples of non-transitive systems satisfying this property. As an application, we show that the $(-\beta)$-transformation satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure and the rate function is the free energy under the condition that $\beta > 1$ is a Yrrap number, that is, the orbit of 1 under the $(-\beta)$-transformation is eventually periodic.

1. Introduction

The specification property was introduced by Bowen in [1] to study the ergodic property of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. After that several authors introduced various weaker forms of this property such as weak specification property ([7, 14]), almost specification property ([17, 21]), specification property for collection of good words ([4]) and non-uniform specification property ([22]) (see also [12] for details). These weaker forms of the property hold mainly for topologically transitive systems, for example, ergodic group automorphisms, β-shifts and S-gap shifts. In this paper, we introduce a new weaker form of the specification property called "one-way ((W)-) specification property", which holds for a large class of non-transitive systems and investigate large deviations for systems with this property.

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and f be a Borel measurable map from X to itself. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of all Borel probability measures on X with the weak topology. We say that (X, f) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with a reference measure $m \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ if there is an upper semicontinuous function $q\colon \mathcal{M}(X) \to [-\infty, 0]$, called a rate function, satisfying

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log m\left(\left\{x \in X : \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)} \in G\right\}\right) \geq \sup_{\mu\in G} q(\mu)$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A50, 60F10, 37D35, 37B10.

Key words and phrases. one-way specification property, large deviation principle, $(-\beta)$-transformation.

holds for any open set $G \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log m \left(\left\{ x \in X : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)} \in F \right\} \right) \leq \sup_{\mu \in F} q(\mu)$$

holds for any closed set $F \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$, where δ_y stands for the δ-measure at the point $y \in X$. For an f-invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, let $h(\mu)$ be the metric entropy of μ. For a continuous function $\varphi \colon X \to \mathbb{R}$, we define a free energy function (with respect to φ), $\mathcal{F}_\varphi \colon \mathcal{M}(X) \to [-\infty, 0]$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu) = \begin{cases} h(\mu) - \int \varphi d\mu & (\mu \text{ is invariant}); \\ -\infty & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Now we state our main theorem (see §2.1 for precise definitions).

Theorem A. *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space, $f \colon X \to X$ be a continuous map, $m \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, φ be a continuous function on X and suppose that the four conditions **[A.1]**-**[A.4]** hold.*

[A.1] *(X, f) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property.*

[A.2] $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{x\in X} \left(\frac{1}{n} \log m(B_n(x,\epsilon)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^j(x)) \right) \geq 0.$

[A.3] *The entropy map $\mu \mapsto h(\mu)$ is upper semicontinuous on the set of all f-invariant Borel probability measures on X.*

[A.4] $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in X} \left(\frac{1}{n} \log m(B_n(x,\epsilon)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^j(x)) \right) \leq 0.$

Here $B_n(x,\epsilon) := \{y \in X : d(f^j(x), f^j(y)) \leq \epsilon,\ 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$. Then (X, f) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with m and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi \colon \mathcal{M}(X) \to [-\infty, 0]$ given by (1.1).

As a consequence of Theorem A, we have the following results for symbolic systems and piecewise expanding interval systems (for precise definitions, see §2.2 and §2.3).

Corollary 1. *Let (X, σ) be a subshift on a finite alphabet, $m \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\varphi \colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the language of X. Suppose that the three conditions **[1.1]**-**[1.3]** hold.*

[1.1] *(X, σ) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property.*

[1.2] $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{w\in\mathcal{L},|w|=n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \log m([w]) + \inf_{\omega\in[w]} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\sigma^j(\omega)) \right) \geq 0.$

[1.3] $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{L},|w|=n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \log m([w]) + \sup_{\omega\in[w]} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\sigma^j(\omega)) \right) \leq 0.$

Here $[w]$ denotes the cylinder set for $w \in \mathcal{L}$. Then (X, σ) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with m and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi \colon \mathcal{M}(X) \to [-\infty, 0]$ given by (1.1).

Corollary 2. *Let $([0,1], f)$ be a piecewise expanding interval system, (Σ_f, σ) be a symbolic space of $([0,1], f)$, L be the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$ and $\varphi \colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Suppose that the two conditions **[2.1]** and **[2.2]** hold.*

- ***[2.1]*** *There exists a measurable map $\Phi \colon [0,1] \to \Sigma_f$ such that $\Psi \circ \Phi \colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is an identity map and $\Phi \circ f = \sigma \circ \Phi$. Moreover, there exists a Borel set $Y \subset \Sigma_f$ such that $[0,1] \setminus \Psi(Y)$ is countable and $\Phi \circ \Psi \colon Y \to \Phi(\Psi(Y))$ is an identity map.*
- ***[2.2]*** *(Σ_f, σ) satisfies the conditions **[1.1]**-**[1.3]** of Corollary 1 for $L_f := L \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and $\varphi \circ \Psi$.*

Here $\Psi \colon \Sigma_f \to [0,1]$ is the natural factor map. Then (I, f) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with L and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi \colon \mathcal{M}([0,1]) \to [-\infty, 0]$ given by (1.1).

In this paper, we give several examples of systems with the one-way ((W)-) specification property. The main example is a $(-\beta)$-transformation. The $(-\beta)$-transformation was recently introduced by Ito and Sadahiro in [11] and several authors considered problems of $(-\beta)$-transformations, which are also considered in β-transformations ([6, 10, 13]). In the case of β-transformations, Pfister and Sullivan [16] proved a level-2 large deviation principle. As an application of Corollary 2, we prove the analogous result for $(-\beta)$-transformations under the condition that $\beta > 1$ is a Yrrap number.

Theorem B. *Let $T_{-\beta} \colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be a $(-\beta)$-transformation, L be the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$ and $\varphi \colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a constant function $\varphi \equiv \log \beta$. Suppose that $\beta > 1$ is a Yrrap number, that is, the orbit of 1 under $T_{-\beta}$ is eventually periodic. Then $([0,1], T_{-\beta})$ satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with L and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi \colon \mathcal{M}([0,1]) \to [-\infty, 0]$ given by (1.1).*

Remark 1.1. We note that our definition of the $(-\beta)$-transformation is slightly different from the original one [11] (see Remark 3.5).

Large deviations theory for dynamical systems has been studied by many authors and several authors proved a full large deviation principle such as [2, 3, 5, 9, 16, 20, 23, 24] (for other results, see [5, §1]). The common property which holds for systems appeared in these papers are "entropy-density", that is, any invariant measure can be approximated by ergodic measures with similar entropies (see [16] for the precise definition). In the case of $(-\beta)$-transformations, if β is a minimal Pisot number, then it is also a Yrrap number and the set of all $T_{-\beta}$-ergodic measures are not entropy-dense (even not dense) in the set of all invariant measures. Thus by Theorem B, $(-\beta)$-transformation for the minimal Pisot number β satisfies a level-2 large

deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure and the rate function is the free energy though the set of ergodic measures are not entropy-dense. As far as we know, this is the first non-trivial example satisfying such properties. On the other hand, as mentioned above, Pfister and Sullivan [16] proved that the β-transformation ($\beta > 1$) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with a unique measure of maximal entropy and the rate function is the free energy. In this case, it is well-known that the unique measure of maximal entropy is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, with a density bounded above by $\beta/(\beta-1)$ and below by $(\beta-1)/\beta$ (see [15, 18]). Thus, the β-transformation also satisfies a large deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure and the rate function is the free energy as in the case of the measure of maximal entropy. However, it occurs a different phenomenon in the case of $(-\beta)$-transformations. Indeed, as a consequence of Theorem B, if β is a minimal Pisot number, then the $(-\beta)$-transformation satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with both the Lebesgue measure and the measure of maximal entropy, but these two rate functions do not coincide (see Example 6.5).

This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we establish our definitions. In §3, we give several examples of systems satisfying the one-way ((W)-) specification property. In §4, we give a proof of Theorem A and also give a proof of Corollaries 1 and 2 in §5. In §6, we apply our results to systems appeared in §3.1 and prove Theorem B.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Definitions, basic facts and lemmas.** Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and $f\colon X \to X$ be a continuous map. We denote by $C(X)$ the Banach space of continuous real-valued functions of X with the sup norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of all Borel probability measures on X with the weak topology. Since $C(X)$ is separable, there exists a countable set $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \cdots\}$ which is dense in $C(X)$. For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, we define

$$D(\mu,\nu) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\int \varphi_n d\mu - \int \varphi_n d\nu|}{2^{n+1}\|\varphi_n\|_\infty}.$$

Then D is a compatible metric for $\mathcal{M}(X)$. By an easy calculation, we have the following.

Lemma 2.1. (1) $D(\mu,\nu) \le 1$ holds for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$.
(2) Let $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i\mu_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i\nu_i$ be finite convex conbinations of Borel probability measures on X. Then we have

$$D\left(\sum_{i=1}^p a_i\mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^p a_i\nu_i\right) \le \sum_{i=1}^p a_i D(\mu_i,\nu_i).$$

(3) Let $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i\mu_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p b_i\nu_i$ be finite convex conbinations of Borel probability measures on X. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^p |a_i - b_i| \le \zeta$ and $D(\mu_i,\nu_i) \le \zeta$

for $1 \le i \le p$. Then we have

$$D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} a_i\mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i\nu_i\right) \le 2\zeta.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_f(X) \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ be the set of all f-invariant Borel probability measures, and let $\mathcal{M}_f^e(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ be the set of all ergodic measures. For $n \ge 1$, we define $\mathcal{E}_n \colon X \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ by $\mathcal{E}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)}$.

Before giving a definition of the one-way specification property, we recall the definition of the classical specification property. We say that (X, f) satisfies the specification property if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $M \ge 0$ such that for any $x_1, \cdots, x_k \in X$ and any $n_1, \cdots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $y \in X$ such that $d(f^i(x_j), f^{i+\sum_{t=1}^{j-1}(n_t+M)}(y)) \le \epsilon$ holds for $0 \le i \le n_j - 1$ and $1 \le j \le k$. Here we set $\sum_{t=1}^{0}(n_t + M) := 0$. Roughly speaking, the specification property guarantees that the existence of an orbit, which traces all specified orbit-segments. The one-way specification property, defined below, guarantees that the existence of an orbit, which traces specified orbit-segments "contained in the non-wandering set". A point $x \in X$ is said to be non-wandering if for every neighborhood U of x, there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that $U \cap f^{-n}(U) \ne \emptyset$. The set of all non-wandering points is called the non-wandering set and denoted by $\Omega(f)$. It is well-known that $\mu(\Omega(f)) = 1$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ (see [8, Proposition 6.19] for instance). Then we define the main property of this paper.

Definition 2.2. We say that (X, f) satisfies the one-way specification property if there exist compact subsets $X_1, \cdots, X_q$ of X such that

(1) $f(X_i) \subset X_i$ for $1 \le i \le q$,
(2) $\Omega(f) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} X_i$,
(3) for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $M \ge 0$ such that for any $x_1 \in X_{i(1)}, \cdots, x_k \in X_{i(k)}$ with $i(1) \le \cdots \le i(k)$ and any $n_1, \cdots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $y \in X$ such that

$$d(f^i(x_j), f^{i+\sum_{t=1}^{j-1}(n_t+M)}(y)) \le \epsilon \qquad (0 \le i \le n_j - 1,\ 1 \le j \le k).$$

Here we set $\sum_{i=1}^{0}(n_t + M) := 0$.

Our main examples appeared in §3.2 do not satisfy the one-way specification property in general. But they always satisfy the one-way (W)-specification property defined below, which is slightly weaker than the one-way specification property.

Definition 2.3. We say that (X, f) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property if there exist compact subsets $X_1, \cdots, X_q$ of X such that

(1) $f(X_i) \subset X_i$ for $1 \le i \le q$,
(2) $\Omega(f) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} X_i$,
(3) for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $M \ge 0$ such that for any $x_1 \in X_{i(1)}, \cdots, x_k \in X_{i(k)} \in X$ with $i(1) \le \cdots \le i(k)$ and any

$n_1, \cdots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $y \in X$ and integers $M_1, \cdots, M_{k-1} \leq M$ such that

$$d(f^i(x_j), f^{i+\sum_{t=1}^{j-1}(n_t+M_t)}(y)) \leq \epsilon \qquad (0 \leq i \leq n_j - 1,\ 1 \leq j \leq k).$$

Here we set $\sum_{i=1}^{0}(n_t + M_t) := 0$.

The sense of "one-way" in the above definitions seems to be well-understood once we give examples in §3 (in particular, see Figures 2, 3 and 5). We sometimes say that (X, f) satisfies the one-way specification property (or (W)-specification property) "with $\{X_1, \cdots, X_q\}$". We note that if (X, f) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property with $\{X_1, \cdots, X_q\}$, then every ergodic measure is supported on some X_i $(1 \leq i \leq q)$. In fact, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f^e(X)$ and $X_1, \cdots, X_q$ be compact subsets of X. Suppose that $f(X_i) \subset X_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ and $\Omega(f) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} X_i$. Then there exists an integer $1 \leq i \leq q$ such that $\mu(X_i) = 1$.

Proof. Since $\mu(\Omega(f)) = 1$, there exists an integer $1 \leq i \leq q$ such that $\mu(X_i) > 0$. Let G_μ be the set of all generic points for μ, that is

$$G_\mu = \left\{ x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(x) = \mu \right\}$$

(see [8, p.21]). Since μ is ergodic, we have $\mu(G_\mu) = 1$, and which implies that $\mu(G_\mu \cap X_i) > 0$. In particular, $G_\mu \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$.

Let us take a point $x \in G_\mu \cap X_i$. Then it follows from $f(X_i) \subset X_i$ that $f^n(x) \in X_i$ for $n \geq 0$, which implies $(\mathcal{E}_n(x))(X_i) = 1$ for any $n \geq 1$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(x) = \mu$ and X_i is compact, we have

$$\mu(X_i) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} (\mathcal{E}_n(x))(X_i) = 1,$$

which proves the lemma. □

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \geq 1$. A subset $E \subset X$ is called (n, ϵ)-separated if for any two distinct points $x, y \in E$, there exists $0 \leq j \leq n-1$ such that $d(f^j(x), f^j(y)) > \epsilon$. To show Theorem A , we use the following result, which is derived by a tiny modification of [16, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 2.5. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f^e(X)$ and any $h < h(\mu)$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any neighborhood F of μ, there exists an integer $N > 0$ such that for any $n \geq N$ and for any Borel subset $B \subset X$ with $\mu(B) = 1$, there exists an (n, ϵ)-separated set $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{E}_n^{-1}(F) \cap B$ such that $\sharp\Gamma \geq e^{nh}$.

2.2. **Symbolic dynamics.** Let A be a finite set and $A^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ ($\mathbb{Z} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$) be the set of all one-sided infinite sequences on the alphabet A, endowed with the standard metric $d(\omega, \omega') = 2^{-t(\omega,\omega')}$, where $t(\omega, \omega') = \min\{k : \omega_k \neq \omega'_k\}$. The shift map $\sigma\colon A^{\mathbb{Z}_+} \to A^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is defined by $(\sigma(\omega))_i = \omega_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 0$. We say that a compact subset $X \subset A^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a subshift if $\sigma(X) \subset X$ holds. We often denote σ instead of the restriction map $\sigma|_X$ if no confusion arises. The

language of X, denoted by $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(X)$, is the set of all finite words that appear in any sequence $\omega \in X$, that is,

$$\mathcal{L}(X) := \{w \in A^* : [w] \neq \emptyset\},$$

where $A^* = \bigcup_{n\geq 0} A^n$ and $[w] = \{\omega \in X : \omega_0 \cdots \omega_{n-1} = w\}$ is a cylinder set for $w \in A^n$. Given $w \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, let $|w|$ denote the length of w, and set $\mathcal{L}_n(X) = \{w \in \mathcal{L}(X) : |w| = n\}$ for $n \geq 1$. By our choice of the metric d on $A^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. Let (X, σ) be a subshift on a finite alphabet.

(1) (X, σ) satisfies the one-way specification property if and only if there exist subshifts $X_1, \cdots, X_q \subset X$ and an integer $M \geq 0$ such that $\Omega(\sigma|_X) = \bigcup_{i=1}^q \Omega(\sigma|_{X_i})$, and for any $w_1 \in \mathcal{L}(X_{i(1)}), \cdots, w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X_{i(k)})$ with $i(1) \leq \cdots \leq i(k)$, there exist $v_1, \cdots, v_{k-1} \in \mathcal{L}_M(X)$ such that $w_1v_1w_2v_2 \cdots w_{k-1}v_{k-1}w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X)$.
(2) (X, σ) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property if and only if there exist subshifts $X_1, \cdots, X_q \subset X$ and an integer $M \geq 0$ such that $\Omega(\sigma|_X) = \bigcup_{i=1}^q \Omega(\sigma|_{X_i})$, and for any $w_1 \in \mathcal{L}(X_{i(1)}), \cdots, w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X_{i(k)})$ with $i(1) \leq \cdots \leq i(k)$, there exist $v_1, \cdots, v_{k-1} \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ such that $|v_i| \leq M$ for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $w_1v_1w_2v_2 \cdots w_{k-1}v_{k-1}w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X)$.

2.3. **Symbolic spaces of piecewise expanding interval systems.** Let $I = [0, 1]$ be the unit interval, and let $f\colon I \to I$ be such that there exist $p \geq 2$ and $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_p = 1$ such that writing $I_j = (a_j, a_{j+1})$, the restriction $f|_{I_j}$ is C^1 and satisfies $\alpha \leq |f'(x)| \leq \beta$ $(x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{p-1} I_j)$ for some $1 < \alpha \leq \beta$. We say that (I, f) is a piecewise expanding interval system.

Let $A = \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $S = \{a_0, \cdots, a_p\}$ and $I' = I \setminus \bigcup_{i\geq 0} f^{-i}S$. We define the map $i'\colon I' \to A^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ by $(i'(x))_k = j$ if $f^k(x) \in I_j$. We note that i' is well-defined and injective on I' since $|f'(x)| \geq \alpha > 1$ for all $x \in I \setminus S$. We set $\Sigma_f = \mathrm{cl}\{i'(I')\}$, where $\mathrm{cl}(A)$ denotes the closure of the set A. Then (Σ_f, σ) is a subshift. We call (Σ_f, σ) the symbolic space of (I, f).

We define $\Psi\colon \Sigma_f \to I$ by $\Psi(\omega) = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} f^{-k}\mathrm{cl}(I_{\omega_k})$. It is well-known that (I, f) is a topological factor of (Σ_f, σ) with Ψ as a factor map.

3. Examples

3.1. **Simple examples.** In this subsection, we give simple examples of symbolic and non-symbolic systems, which satisfies the one-way specification property.

Example 3.1. We consider a piecewise expanding interval system whose symbolic space has the one-way specification property. Let $I = [0, 1]$ be the

unit interval and define $f\colon I \to I$ by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 3x & (0 \le x < \frac{1}{6}); \\ 3x - \frac{1}{2} & (\frac{1}{6} \le x < \frac{1}{2}); \\ 3x - 1 & (\frac{1}{2} \le x < \frac{2}{3}); \\ 3x - \frac{3}{2} & (\frac{2}{3} \le x < \frac{5}{6}); \\ 3x - 2 & (\frac{5}{6} \le x \le 1). \end{cases}$$

(A graph of f is sketched in Figure 1.) Let (Σ_f, σ) be the symbolic space of



FIGURE 1. A graph of f.

(I, f). Then it is not difficult to see that the language of Σ_f is the set of all subwords of the form $w1v$ ($w \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$, $v \in \{2,3,4\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$). In other words, Σ_f is the set of all infinite paths started from some vertex of a Graph Γ, which is shown in Figure 2. Thus, (Σ_f, σ) satisfies the one-way specification



FIGURE 2. A graph Γ.

property with $\{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}, \{2,3,4\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}\}$.

Example 3.2. Let S^1 be the circle $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and take a system of representatives $[0,1)$ of S^1. We define $f\colon S^1 \to S^1$ by

$$f(\theta) = \theta + \frac{1}{10}\sin(2\pi\theta).$$

In Figure 3, we sketch a phase portrait of f. Then it is known that $\Omega(f) =$



FIGURE 3. A phase portrait of f. The non-wandering set of f consists of only two points 0 and $\frac{1}{2}$. 0 is a unique source and $\frac{1}{2}$ is a unique sink.

$\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ (see [19, Example 12.1 in §8.12] for instance) and it is not difficult to see that f satisfies the one-way specification property with $\{\{0\}, \{\frac{1}{2}\}\}$.

3.2. **$(-\beta)$-transformations.** For $\beta > 1$, we define a $(-\beta)$-transformation $T_{-\beta}\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ as follows. Let $b := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k < \beta\}$ and set $I_i := \left(\frac{i}{\beta}, \frac{i+1}{\beta}\right)$ for $0 \le i \le b-1$ and $I_b := \left(\frac{b}{\beta}, 1\right)$. First, we define values of $T_{-\beta}$ on $\bigcup_{i=0}^{b} I_b$ by

$$T_{-\beta}(x) := -\beta x + (i+1) \qquad (0 \le i \le b).$$

Then, for $x \notin \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} T_{-\beta}^{-i}\left(\left\{0, \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots, \frac{b}{\beta}, 1\right\}\right)$, one can define $i'(x) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, b\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ by $(i'(x))_k = j$ if $T_{-\beta}^k(x) \in I_j$. We set $i'(1) := \lim_{x \to 1-0} i'(x)$.

In what follows we will define values of $T_{-\beta}$ on $\left\{0, \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots \frac{b}{\beta}, 1\right\}$.

Case 1. $i'(1)$ is of the form $(w0)^\infty = w0w0w0\cdots$ for some $w \in \{0, 1, \cdots, b\}^*$.

In this case, we define $T_{-\beta}$ on $\left\{0, \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots \frac{b}{\beta}, 1\right\}$ by

$$T_{-\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & (x = 0); \\ 0 & (x = \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots, \frac{b}{\beta}); \\ \lim_{x \to 1-0} T_{-\beta}(x) & (x = 1). \end{cases}$$

Case 2. $i'(1)$ is not of the form $(w0)^\infty = w0w0w0\cdots$.

In this case, we define $T_{-\beta}$ on $\left\{0, \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots \frac{b}{\beta}, 1\right\}$ by

$$T_{-\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & (x = 0); \\ 1 & (x = \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots, \frac{b}{\beta}); \\ \lim_{x \to 1-0} T_{-\beta}(x) & (x = 1). \end{cases}$$

(The situations are sketched in Figure 4 for $i'(1) = (1000)^\infty$, $i'(1) = (2011)^\infty$ and $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$.)



FIGURE 4. Graphs of $T_{-\beta}$ for $i'(1) = (1000)^\infty$ (left), $i'(1) = (2011)^\infty$ (center) and $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$ (right).

We define the alternating order $<_{\text{alt}}$ on $\{0, 1, \cdots, b\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ by

$(\omega_i) <_{\text{alt}} (\omega'_i)$ if and only if $x_i = y_i$ $(0 \le i \le n-1)$ and $\begin{cases} \omega_n < \omega'_n & (n \text{ is odd}); \\ \omega_n > \omega'_n & (n \text{ is even}) \end{cases}$

hold. We denote $(\omega_i) \le_{\text{alt}} (\omega'_i)$ if either $(\omega_i) <_{\text{alt}} (\omega'_i)$ or $(\omega_i) = (\omega'_i)$ holds. Let $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ be the symbolic space of $([0, 1], T_{-\beta})$. Then following the proofs appeared in [11, §2] with a tiny modification, we have

$$\Sigma_{-\beta} = \{(\omega_i) : \sigma^n((\omega_i)) \le_{\text{alt}} i'(1) \text{ for } n \ge 0\}. \tag{3.1}$$

We denote $i'(1) = s_0 s_1 s_2 \cdots$ and let $\Gamma_{-\beta}$ be a graph constructed by the following rule.

- there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{s_i} V_{i+1}$ for any $i \ge 0$.
- If i is even, $0 \le a \le s_i - 1$, and $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of maximal length of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1} a$, then there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{a} V_j$.
- If i is odd, $s_i + 1 \le b \le s_0$, and $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of maximal length of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1} b$, then there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{b} V_j$.
- If i is odd and $s_i < s_0$, then there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{s_0} V_1$.

The situation is sketched in Figure 5 for $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$. Then by the equation (3.1) and the definition of the alternating order, we have

$\Sigma_{-\beta} = \{\text{Set of all one-sided infinite paths started from some vertex } V_i \text{ of } \Gamma_{-\beta}\}$.

In what follows we will show the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. Suppose that $i'(1)$ is eventually periodic. Then $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property.



FIGURE 5. A graph $\Gamma_{-\beta}$ for $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$.

Proof. We denote $i'(1) = s_0 s_1 s_2 \cdots = t_0 \cdots t_{u-1}(t_u \cdots t_{u+v-1})^\infty$ for some $u \geq 0$ and $v \geq 1$. Since $i'(1) = \lim_{x \to 1-0} i'(x) = s_0 s_1 \cdots$, the cylinder set $[s_0 \cdots s_i]$ is not a single point set for any $i \geq 0$. Thus, there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{a} V_j$ for some $i \geq u+v+2$, $j < i$ and $0 \leq a \leq s_0$.

Lemma 3.4. We have $j \leq u+v$. Moreover, for each $n \geq 0$, there is an edge $V_{i+2nv} \xrightarrow{a} V_j$.

Proof. First we show $j \leq u+v$. By contradiction, suppose that $j \geq u+v+1$. Since there is an edge $V_i \xrightarrow{a} V_j$, $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of maximal length of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}a$. Thus we can find a word w' such that $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}a = w' s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$. Since $j \geq u+v+1$, we have $s_{j-1} = s_{j-v-1}$. Therefore we have $a = s_{j-1} = s_{j-v-1} = s_{i-v} = s_i$, which contradicts with $s_i \neq a$.

Let $n \geq 0$. Since $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}a$ and $j \leq u+v$, $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is also the suffix of $s_0 \cdots s_{i+2nv-1}a$. In what follows we will show that $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of maximal length of $s_0 \cdots s_{i+2nv-1}a$. By contradiction, we assume that there exists a number $j' > j$ such that $s_0 \cdots s_{j'-1}$ is the suffix of $s_0 \cdots s_{i+2nv-1}a$. Then $s_0 \cdots s_j$ is the suffix of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}a$. However, $s_0 \cdots s_{j-1}$ is the suffix of maximal length of $s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}a$. This is a contradiction. □

For integers $0 \leq n \leq m$, let $\Gamma_{n,m}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{n,\infty}$) be a subgraph of $\Gamma_{-\beta}$ from V_n to V_m (resp. from V_n), that is, the vertexes of $\Gamma_{n.m}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{n,\infty}$) are $V_n, V_{n+1}, \cdots, V_m$ (resp. $V_n, V_{n+1}, \cdots$) and the edges of $\Gamma_{n,m}$ are the set of all edges of $\Gamma_{-\beta}$ from V_i to V_j for some $n \leq i, j \leq m$ (resp. $i, j \geq n$). We set

$$N := \min\{k \geq 0 : \Gamma_{k,\infty} \text{ is irreducible}\}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, such N exists. We define sequences of integers $\{l_i\}$ and $\{n_i\}$ inductively as follows. First, we set $l_1 := 0$ and

$$n_1 := \max\{l_1 \leq k < N : \Gamma_{l_1,k} \text{ is irreducible}\}.$$

Next, we set

$$l_2 := \min\{k > n_1 : \text{there are at least two edges into } V_k\} \text{ and}$$

$$n_2 := \{l_2 \leq k < N : \Gamma_{l_2,k} \text{ is irreducible}\}.$$

Using this procedure inductively, we can construct integers $0 = l_1 \le n_1 < l_2 \le n_2 < \cdots < l_{q-1} \le n_{q-1} < l_q = N < n_q = \infty$ such that

- Γ_{l_i,n_i} is irreducible for each $1 \le i \le q$;
- $V_k \xrightarrow{s_k} V_{k+1}$ is only edge into V_k for $n_i \le k \le l_{i+1}$ and $1 \le i \le q-1$;
- there is no edge from V_k ($k \notin \{l_i, \cdots, n_i\}$) to Γ_{l_i,n_i} except $V_{l_i-1} \xrightarrow{s_{l_i-1}} V_{l_i}$ for $1 \le i \le q$.

(In Figure 6, we sketched the situation for $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$.)



FIGURE 6. A graph representation of $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ for $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$.

Let X_i be a subshift generated by the graph Γ_{l_i,n_i} for $1 \le i \le q$. More precisely, X_i is the set of all infinite paths started from some vertex in Γ_{l_i,n_i}. In what follows we will show that $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property with $\{X_1, \cdots, X_q\}$. Since $i'(1)$ is eventually periodic, we can show that X_q is sofic in a similar way to the proof of [10, Proposition 2]. Thus, X_i is sofic and irreducible for each $1 \le i \le q$. Thus, X_i satisfies the (W)-specification property, that is, there exists an integer $M \ge 0$ such that for any $w_1, \cdots, w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X_i)$, we can find $v_1, \cdots, v_{k-1} \in \mathcal{L}(X_i)$ such that $|v_j| \le M$ for $1 \le j \le k-1$ and

$$w_1 v_1 w_2 v_2 \cdots w_{k-1} v_{k-1} w_k \in \mathcal{L}(X_i).$$

Therefore, $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property with $\{X_1, \cdots, X_q\}$. □

Remark 3.5. As we mentioned in §1, our definition of the $(-\beta)$-transformation is slightly different from the original one in [11]. Ito and Sadahiro introduced a $(-\beta)$-transformation $T^{\mathrm{IS}}_{-\beta}$ on the interval $[\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1})$ defined by $T^{\mathrm{IS}}_{-\beta}(x) := -\beta x - \lfloor \frac{\beta}{\beta+1} - \beta x \rfloor$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer not exceeding a real number x. After that, Liao and Steiner [13] considered a $(-\beta)$-transformation $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}$ on the interval $(0, 1]$ defined by $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}(x) := -\beta x + \lfloor \beta x \rfloor + 1$, which is topologically conjugate to $T^{\mathrm{IS}}_{-\beta}$. Then, the differences between our $T_{-\beta}$ and Liao-Steiner's $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}$ are the following.

- $T_{-\beta}$ is defined on $[0,1]$, but $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}$ is defined on $(0,1]$.
- In *Case* 1, that is, $i'(1)$ is of the form $(w0)^\infty$, then $T_{-\beta}(x) = 0$ but $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}(x) = 1$ for $x = \frac{1}{\beta}, \cdots, \frac{b}{\beta}$. If we further assume $\beta > 1$ is an integer, then $T_{-\beta}(1) = 0$ but $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}(1) = 1$.

The reason why we give a slightly modified version of the definition of the $(-\beta)$-transformation is the following.

- To formulate the large deviation principle, one usually requires that the spece is Polish.
- By our definition of $T_{-\beta}$, $\Psi([w])$ is an interval with positive length for any $w \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$, where Ψ is a map defined in §2.3. If we define $T_{-\beta}$ as a natural extension of $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}$, then it may occur that $\Psi([w])$ is a single point for some $w \in \Sigma_{-\beta}$.

We note that in *Case* 2, $T_{-\beta}(x) = -\beta x + \lfloor \beta x \rfloor + 1$ and so our definition of the $(-\beta)$-transformation $T_{-\beta}$ is a natural extension of $T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta}$. Therefore, the symbolic space $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ of $([0,1], T_{-\beta})$ coincides with that of $((0,1], T^{\mathrm{LS}}_{-\beta})$ (and so, also with that of $([\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1}), T^{\mathrm{IS}}_{-\beta})$).

4. Proof of Theorem A

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem A. First we establish the upper bound. Since we assume **[A.3]** and **[A.4]**, it follows from [16, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2] that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log m(\{x \in X : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in F\}) \le \sup_{\mu \in F} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu)$$

holds for any closed set $F \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$.

To get the lower bound, it is sufficient to show that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ and any open neighborhood $G \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ of μ,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log m(\{x \in X : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in G\}) \ge h(\mu) - \int \varphi d\mu \tag{4.1}$$

holds. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$, G be an open neighborhood of μ and $\eta > 0$. Choose $\zeta > 0$ so small that $D(\mu, \nu) \le 5\zeta$ implies that $\nu \in G$ and $|\int \varphi d\mu - \int \varphi d\nu| \le \eta$. It follows from **[A.2]** that there exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $0 < \epsilon \le \epsilon_1$, for any $n \ge N_1$ and for any $x \in X$,

$$m(B_n(x, \epsilon)) \ge \exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^j(x)) - n\eta \right)$$

holds. We can also find $0 < \epsilon_2 \le \epsilon_1$ such that $D(\delta_x, \delta_y) \le \zeta$ whenever $d(x, y) \le 2\epsilon_2$.

On the other hand, by Ergodic Decomposition Theorem and the affinity of the entropy map, there exists $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^p a_i \mu_i$ such that

- the μ_i are ergodic;
- the a_i are real numbers in $(0,1]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i = 1$;

- $D(\mu,\lambda)\le\zeta$;
- $h(\lambda)>h(\mu)-\eta$.

By the condition **[A.1]**, (X,f) satisfies the one-way (W)-specification property with some $\{X_1,\cdots,X_q\}$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that for each $1\le i\le p$, we can find $1\le j(i)\le q$ such that $\mu_i(X_{j(i)})=1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $j(1)\le j(2)\le\cdots\le j(p)$. By Proposition 2.5, we can find $0<\epsilon\le\epsilon_2$ and $N_2\ge N_1$ such that for any $n\ge N_2$ and any $1\le i\le p$, there exists an $(n_i,3\epsilon)$-separated subset $\Gamma_{n,i}\subset\mathcal{E}_{n_i}^{-1}(\mathbb{B}(\mu_i,\zeta))\cap X_{j(i)}$ such that

$$\sharp\Gamma_{n,i}\ge\exp(n_i(h(\mu_i)-\eta))$$

holds. Here we set $\mathbb{B}(\mu_i,\eta):=\{\nu\in\mathcal{M}(X):D(\mu_i,\nu)\le\eta\}$ and $n_i:=\max\{k\in\mathbb{Z}:a_in\ge k\}$.

Let M be as in the definition of the one-way (W)-specification property. Choose an integer $N\ge N_2$ so large that $\frac{1}{N}\log(M+1)^{p-1}\le\eta$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left|a_i-\frac{n_i}{n_1+\cdots+n_p}\right|\le\zeta$$

hold. Fix any integer $n\ge N$. Then by the one-way (W)-specification property, for any $\mathbb{X}=(x_1,\cdots,x_p)\in\prod_{i=1}^p\Gamma_{n,i}$, we can find $y(\mathbb{X})\in X$ and integers $M_1(\mathbb{X}),\cdots,M_{p-1}(\mathbb{X})\le M$ such that

$$d(f^j(x_i),f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t(\mathbb{X}))}(y(\mathbb{X})))\le\epsilon\qquad(0\le j\le n_i-1,\ 1\le i\le p).$$

Since $0\le M_i(\mathbb{X})\le M$ for $1\le i\le p$, it is easy to see that there exist integers $0\le M_1,\cdots,M_{p-1}\le M$ such that

$$\sharp\left\{\mathbb{X}\in\prod_{i=1}^{p}\Gamma_{n,i}:M_i(\mathbb{X})=M_i,\ 1\le i\le p-1\right\}\ge\frac{1}{(M+1)^{p-1}}\sharp\prod_{i=1}^{p}\Gamma_{n,i}.$$

For the notational simplicity, we set

$$\Gamma_n:=\left\{\mathbb{X}\in\prod_{i=1}^{p}\Gamma_{n,i}:M_i(\mathbb{X})=M_i,\ 1\le i\le p-1\right\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp\Gamma_n&\ge\frac{1}{(M+1)^{p-1}}\sharp\prod_{i=1}^{p}\Gamma_{n,i}\\&\ge\frac{1}{(M+1)^{p-1}}\prod_{i=1}^{p}\exp(n_i(h(\mu_i)-\eta))\\&\ge\frac{1}{(M+1)^{p-1}}\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}a_in(h(\mu_i)-2\eta)\right)\\&\ge\frac{1}{(M+1)^{p-1}}\exp(n(h(\mu)-3\eta))\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \exp(n(h(\mu)-4\eta)).$$

We set $\tilde{n} := \sum_{i=1}^{p-1}(n_i+M_i)+n_p$. Taking N large if necessary, we may assume that

$$D\left(\mathcal{E}_n(x), \sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{n_i}{n_1+\cdots+n_p}\mathcal{E}_{n_i}(f^{\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(x))\right) \leq \zeta$$

for $x \in X$, $\frac{\tilde{n}-n}{n}\int \varphi d\mu \leq \eta$, $\frac{2\tilde{n}}{n}\eta \leq 3\eta$ and $\tilde{n} \geq \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ hold.

Lemma 4.1. For any $\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}' \in \Gamma_n$ with $\mathbb{X} \neq \mathbb{X}'$, we have

$$B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}), \epsilon) \cap B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}'), \epsilon) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. We denote $\mathbb{X} = (x_1, \cdots, x_p)$ and $\mathbb{X}' = (x_1', \cdots, x_p')$. By $\mathbb{X} \neq \mathbb{X}'$, we can find $1 \leq i \leq p$ such that $x_i \neq x_i'$. Since $x_i, x_i' \in \Gamma_{n,i}$ and $\Gamma_{n,i}$ is $(n_i, 3\epsilon)$-separated, there exists $0 \leq j \leq n_i - 1$ such that $d(f^j(x_i), f^j(x_i')) > 3\epsilon$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(y(\mathbb{X})), f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(y(\mathbb{X}'))) \\
\geq\ & d(f^j(x_i), f^j(x_i')) - d(f^j(x_i), f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(y(\mathbb{X}))) \\
& \qquad - d(f^j(x_i'), f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(y(\mathbb{X}'))) \\
>\ & 3\epsilon - 2\epsilon \\
=\ & \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. □

Lemma 4.2. Suppose that $\mathbb{X} \in \Gamma_n$ and $x \in B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}), \epsilon)$. Then we have $D(\mu, \mathcal{E}_n(x)) \leq 5\zeta$. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_n(x) \in G$ and $\left|\int \varphi d\mu - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\varphi(f^j(x))\right| \leq \eta$ hold.

Proof. Denote $\mathbb{X} = (x_1, \cdots, x_p)$ and suppose that $x \in B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}), \epsilon)$. Then we have

$$d(f^j(x_i), f^{j+\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(x)) \leq 2\epsilon \qquad (0 \leq j \leq n_i - 1,\ 1 \leq i \leq p).$$

Thus, it follows from $x_i \in \mathcal{E}_{n_i}^{-1}(\mathbb{B}(\mu_i, \zeta))$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$ and Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
D(\mu, \mathcal{E}_n(x)) &\leq D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}a_i\mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{n_i}{n_1+\cdots+n_p}\mathcal{E}_{n_i}(f^{\sum_{t=1}^{i-1}(n_t+M_t)}(x))\right) + 2\zeta \\
&\leq D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}a_i\mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{n_i}{n_1+\cdots+n_p}\mathcal{E}_{n_i}(x_i)\right) + 3\zeta \\
&\leq 5\zeta,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. □

Now we continue the proof of Theorem A. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log m(\{x \in X : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in G\})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log m \left(\bigcup_{\mathbb{X}\in\Gamma_n} B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}), \epsilon) \right) \\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\mathbb{X}\in\Gamma_n} m\left(B_{\tilde{n}}(y(\mathbb{X}), \epsilon)\right) \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sharp\Gamma_n \exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{n}-1} \varphi(f^j(y(\mathbb{X}))) - \tilde{n}\eta \right) \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \exp\left(n(h(\mu) - 4\eta) - \tilde{n} \int \varphi d\mu - 2\tilde{n}\eta \right) \\
&\geq h(\mu) - \int \varphi d\mu - 8\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies the equation (4.1).

5. Proof of the corollaries

5.1. **Proof of Corollary 1.** In this subsection, we give a proof of Corollary 1. It is well-known that if X is a subshift, then the entropy map $\mu \mapsto h(\mu)$ is upper-semicontinuous on $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X)$. Thus, Theorem A together with [16, Proposition 4.2] imply the corollary.

5.2. **Proof of Corollary 2.** The purpose of this subsection is to prove Corollary 2. For $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_f)$, we set $\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}) := \tilde{\mu} \circ \Psi^{-1}$. To prove Corollary 2, we use the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. The map $\hat{\Psi}\colon \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_f) \to \mathcal{M}([0,1])$ is continuous.

Proof. Suppose that $\{\tilde{\mu}_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_f)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\mu}_n = \tilde{\mu}$. Then for any continuous function $\psi\colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} \int \psi d\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}_n) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int \psi \circ \Psi d\tilde{\mu}_n \\
&= \int \psi \circ \Psi d\tilde{\mu} \\
&= \int \psi d\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\hat{\Psi}$ is continuous. □

By Corollary 1 and the condition **[2.2]**, (Σ_f, σ) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with L_f and the rate function is the free energy $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\colon \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_f) \to [-\infty, 0]$ with respect to $\varphi \circ \Psi$, that is,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mu) = \begin{cases} h(\mu) - \int \varphi \circ \Psi d\mu & (\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_f)); \\ -\infty & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_\varphi\colon \mathcal{M}([0,1]) \to [-\infty, 0]$ be the free energy with respect to φ given by (1.1).

Lemma 5.2. For any subset $H \subset \mathcal{M}([0,1])$, we have

$$\sup_{\tilde{\mu}\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)} \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}) = \sup_{\mu\in H} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu).$$

Proof. First we show the inequality $\sup_{\tilde{\mu}\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)} \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}) \le \sup_{\mu\in H} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu)$. Let $\tilde{\mu} \in \hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)$. Then it is sufficient to show that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}) \le \sup_{\mu\in H} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu). \tag{5.1}$$

If $\tilde{\mu}$ is not σ-invariant, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}) = -\infty$ and so the inequality (5.1) is trivial. Thus, we assume that $\tilde{\mu}$ is σ-invariant. Since Ψ is injective away from a countable set, we have $h(\tilde{\mu}) = h(\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}))$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}) &= h(\tilde{\mu}) - \int \varphi\circ\Psi d\tilde{\mu} \\
&= h(\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu})) - \int \varphi d\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}) \\
&= \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu})) \\
&\le \sup_{\mu\in H} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows from $\tilde{\mu} \in \hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)$. Thus, we have (5.1).

Next, we show the opposite inequality. Let $\mu \in H$. It is sufficient to show that

$$\mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu) \le \sup_{\tilde{\mu}\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)} \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}). \tag{5.2}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that μ is f-invariant. We set $\tilde{\mu} := \mu\circ\Phi^{-1}$. Since $\Psi\circ\Phi$ is an identity map, we have $\hat{\Psi}(\tilde{\mu}) = \mu$ and so $\tilde{\mu} \in \hat{\Psi}^{-1}(H)$. Moreover, since Φ is injective, we have $h(\mu) = h(\tilde{\mu})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu) &= h(\mu) - \int \varphi d\mu \\
&= h(\tilde{\mu}) - \int \varphi\circ\Psi d\tilde{\mu} \\
&= \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (5.2). □

Now, we prove Corollary 2. First we show

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L(\{x\in[0,1] : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in G\}) \ge \sup_{\mu\in G} \mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu)$$

for any open set $G \subset \mathcal{M}([0,1])$. Take any open set $G \subset \mathcal{M}([0,1])$. By Lemma 5.1, $\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(G)$ is open in $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma_f)$. Since (Σ_f, σ) satisfies a level-2 large

deviation principle with L_f and the rate function is $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log L_f(\{\omega\in\Sigma_f:\mathcal{E}_n(\omega)\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(G)\})\geq\sup_{\tilde{\mu}\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(G)}\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{\mu})=\sup_{\mu\in G}\mathcal{F}_\varphi(\mu),$$

where we use Lemma 5.2 for the last equality. By the condition **[2.1]**, there exists a Borel subset $Y\subset\Sigma_f$ such that $[0,1]\setminus\Psi(Y)$ is countable and both $\Psi\circ\Phi\colon[0,1]\to[0,1]$ and $\Phi\circ\Psi\colon Y\to\Phi(\Psi(Y))$ are identity. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log L(\{x\in[0,1]:\mathcal{E}_n(x)\in G\})\\
=\;&\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log L(\{x\in\Psi(Y):\mathcal{E}_n(x)\in G\})\\
=\;&\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log L_f(\{\omega\in Y:\mathcal{E}_n(\omega)\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(G)\})\\
=\;&\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log L_f(\{\omega\in\Sigma_f:\mathcal{E}_n(\omega)\in\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(G)\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we get the lower bound. The upper bound can be shown similarly.

6. Applications

In this section, we apply Theorem A and Corollary 2 to systems appeared in §3.

6.1. **Simple examples.**

Proposition 6.1. Let (I,f) be as in Example 3.1 and $\varphi\colon I\to\mathbb{R}$ be a constant function $\varphi\equiv\log 3$. Then (I,f) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure L on $[0,1]$, and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi\colon\mathcal{M}([0,1])\to[-\infty,0]$ given by (1.1).

Proof. Let (Σ_f,σ) be the symbolic space of (I,f). We set $J_0=[0,\frac{1}{6})$, $J_1=[\frac{1}{6},\frac{1}{2})$, $J_2=[\frac{1}{2},\frac{2}{3})$, $J_3=[\frac{2}{3},\frac{5}{6})$ and $J_4=[\frac{5}{6},1]$. Define a measurable map $\Phi\colon I\to\Sigma_f$ by

$$(\Phi(x))_i=j\text{ if and only if }f^i(x)\in J_j.$$

Then it is not difficult to see that Φ satisfies **[2.1]**.

Thus, it is sufficient to show that (Σ_f,σ) satisfies the condition **[2.2]** of Corollary 2 for $L_f=L\circ\Phi^{-1}$ and the constant function $\varphi\circ\Psi\equiv\log 3$. As we have shown in Example 3.1, (Σ_f,σ) satisfies the one-way specification property, and so **[1.1]** holds. Since the slope of f is 3, and the definition of Φ, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)3^{-n}\leq L\circ\Phi^{-1}([w])\leq 3^{-n}.$$

This implies that **[1.2]** and **[1.3]** hold for L_f and $\varphi\circ\Psi$. Thus we have **[2.2]** and so the proposition is proved. □

Proposition 6.2. Let (S^1, f) be as in Example 3.2 and $\varphi\colon S^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function defined by $\varphi := \max\{\log f', 0\}$. Then (S^1, f) satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure L on S^1 and the rate function is the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi\colon \mathcal{M}(S^1) \to [-\infty, 0]$ given by (1.1).

Proof. In what follows we will show that (S^1, f), L, and φ satisfy the conditions **[A.1]**-**[A.4]** of Theorem A. (S^1, f) satisfies the one-way specification property with $\{0\}$ and $\{\frac{1}{2}\}$ (see Example 3.2) and so **[A.1]** holds. Since $\Omega(f) = \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$, we have $h(\mu) = 0$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(S^1)$, and so **[A.3]** holds. Since f is a one-dimensional map, by the standard mean value theorem, we can see that L and φ satisfies **[A.2]** and **[A.4]**. Thus the proposition is proved. □

6.2. **$(-\beta)$-transformations; Proof of Theorem B.** The aim of this subsection is to give a proof of Theorem B. Let $\beta > 1$ be a Yrrap number. First we define a map $\Phi\colon [0,1] \to \Sigma_{-\beta}$ as follows: If $i'(1) = (\cdots 0)^\infty$, then let $J_0 = [0, \frac{1}{\beta}]$, $J_i = (\frac{i}{\beta}, \frac{i+1}{\beta}]$ for $1 \le i \le b-1$ and $J_b = (\frac{b}{\beta}, 1]$. If $i'(1)$ is not of the form $(\cdots 0)^\infty$, then let $J_i = [\frac{i}{\beta}, \frac{i+1}{\beta})$ for $0 \le i \le b-1$ and $J_b = [\frac{b}{\beta}, 1]$. Then, we define $\Phi\colon [0,1] \to \Sigma_{-\beta}$ by $(\Phi(x))_i = j$ if and only if $T_{-\beta}(x) \in J_j$. Then, it is not difficult to see that Φ satisfies **[2.1]**.

To prove Theorem B, it is sufficient to show that $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies the condition **[2.2]** for $L_{-\beta} = L \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and the constant function $\varphi \circ \Psi \equiv \log \beta$. By Proposition 3.3, $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies **[1.1]**. Moreover, for $w \in \mathcal{L}_n(\Sigma_{-\beta})$, it is easy to see that $\Phi^{-1}([w])$ is a sub-interval of $(0,1]$ and $T_{-\beta}^n\colon \Phi^{-1}([w]) \to (0,1]$ is a continuous linear map whose slope is equal to β^n. Thus we have

$$L_{-\beta}([w]) = L(\Phi^{-1}([w])) \le \beta^{-n}.$$

This implies **[1.3]**. In what follows we will show that the condition **[1.2]** holds for $L_{-\beta}$ and the constant function $\log \beta$.

Lemma 6.3. Let $w \in \mathcal{L}_n(\Sigma_{-\beta})$ and suppose that there exist $0 \le c < d \le b$ such that $wc, wd \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$. Then

$$L_{-\beta}([w]) \ge \left(1 - \frac{b}{\beta}\right) \beta^{-n}. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. It is easy to see that if $(a_1, a_2) \subset J_i$ and there exists a point $b_1 \in J_j$ such that $T_{-\beta}(b_1) = a_1$, then there exists a point $b_2 \in J_j$ such that $T_{-\beta}(b_2) = a_2$ and $\beta(b_1 - b_2) = a_2 - a_1$. Thus, for any $x \in \Phi^{-1}([w])$,

$$T_{-\beta}^{-1}(\cdots (T_{-\beta}^{-1}(T_{-\beta}^{-1}(w_n\beta^{-1}, T_{-\beta}^{n-1}(x)) \cap J_{w_{n-1}}) \cap J_{w_{n-2}}) \cap \cdots) \cap J_{w_1})$$

is an interval of length $\beta^{-n+1}|T_{-\beta}^{n-1}(x) - w_n\beta^{-1}|$ and is contained in $\Phi^{-1}([w])$. So we have

$$L_{-\beta}([w]) \ge \beta^{-n+1}|T_{-\beta}^{n-1} - w_n\beta^{-1}| \tag{6.2}$$

for any $x \in \Phi^{-1}([w])$. On the other hand, $T_{-\beta}(w_n\beta^{-1}) = 1$ and so $wb \in \Sigma_{-\beta}$. By the assumption, there exists a point $x \in \Phi^{-1}([w])$ such that $T_{-\beta}^n(x) \notin J_b$.

Then we have

$$|T_{-\beta}^n(x) - T_{-\beta}(w_n\beta^{-1})| \geq |J_b| = \left(1 - \frac{b}{\beta}\right),$$

which implies

$$|T_{-\beta}^{n-1}(x) - w_n\beta^{-1}| \geq \beta^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{b}{\beta}\right). \tag{6.3}$$

Combining the equations (6.2) and (6.3), we have (6.1). □

For $w \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$, let $g_\beta(w)$ be a minimum integer $i \geq 0$ so that there exist $v \in \mathcal{L}_i(\Sigma_{-\beta})$ and integers $0 \leq c < d \leq b$ such that $wvc, wvd \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$, and set

$$g_\beta(n) := \sup_{w \in \mathcal{L}_n(\Sigma_{-\beta})} g_\beta(w).$$

for $n \geq 1$.

Lemma 6.4. Suppose that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{g_\beta(n)}{n} = 0$. Then the condition **[1.2]** holds for $L_{-\beta}$ and the constant function $\log\beta$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By the assumption, there exists an integer N such that for any $n \geq N$, $g_\beta(n) \leq n\epsilon$ holds. Fix any $n \geq N$ and $w \in \mathcal{L}_n(\Sigma_{-\beta})$. Then we have $g_\beta(w) \leq g_\beta(n) \leq n\epsilon$. Thus we can find $v \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$ and $0 \leq c < d \leq b$ such that

$$|v| \leq n\epsilon \text{ and } wvc, wvd \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_{-\beta})$$

holds. So it follows from Lemma 6.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{-\beta}([w]) &\geq L_{-\beta}([wv]) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{b}{\beta}\right)\beta^{-|wv|} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{b}{\beta}\right)\beta^{-n(1+\epsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $w \in \mathcal{L}_n(\Sigma_{-\beta})$, $n \geq N$ and $\epsilon > 0$ are arbitrary, the above inequality implies that **[1.2]** holds for $L_{-\beta}$ and the constant function $\log\beta$. □

Thus, it follows from Lemmas 3.4 and 6.4 that the condition **[1.2]** holds for $L_{-\beta}$ and the constant function $\log\beta$. Therefore, $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ satisfies the condition **[2.2]** for $L_{-\beta}$ and the constant function $\varphi \circ \Psi \equiv \log\beta$, and so Theorem B is proved.

Example 6.5. Finally, we give an example of the $(-\beta)$-transformation whose rate functions with respect to Lebesgue measure and maximal entropy measure do not coincide. Let β be the minimal Pisot number, that is, the real root of $X^3 - X - 1 = 0$. Then it is easy to see that $i'(1) = 100(1)^\infty$ and so, β is a Yrrap number and $(\Sigma_{-\beta}, \sigma)$ is generated by a graph $\Gamma_{-\beta}$, which is shown in Figure 5. Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{-\beta}) = \{\delta_{0^\infty}\} \cup \{\delta_{1^\infty}\} \cup \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_3). \tag{6.4}$$

Here X_3 is a subshift generated by a graph $\Gamma_{2,\infty}$ shown in Figure 6. In particular, we can see that $\mathcal{M}_\sigma^e(\Sigma_{-\beta})$ is not dense in $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{-\beta})$. It follows from [13, Corollary 2.4] that $T_{-\beta}$ (resp. $(\Sigma_{-\beta},\sigma)$) admits a unique measure of maximal entropy m (resp. $m_{-\beta}$). Then by (6.4), $m_{-\beta}$ is supported on X_3. Since (X_3,σ) satisfies the (W)-specification, by [5, Theorem A] with an easy additional calculation, we can show that $(\Sigma_{-\beta},\sigma)$ satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with $m_{-\beta}$ and the rate function $q^{m_{-\beta}}\colon \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_{-\beta}) \to [-\infty,0]$ is given by

$$q^{m_{-\beta}}(\mu) = \begin{cases} h(\mu) - \log\beta & (\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_3)); \\ -\infty & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

So in a similar way to the proof of Corollary 2, we can show that $([0,1],T_{-\beta})$ satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with m and the rate function $q^m\colon \mathcal{M}([0,1]) \to [-\infty,0]$ is given by

$$q^{m}(\mu) = \begin{cases} h(\mu) - \log\beta & (\mu \in \hat{\Psi}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_3))); \\ -\infty & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem B, $([0,1],T_{-\beta})$ satisfies a level-2 large deviation principle with the Lebesgue measure and the rate function $q^L\colon \mathcal{M}([0,1]) \to [-\infty,0]$ coincides with the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ given by (1.1) with respect to a constant function $\varphi \equiv \log\beta$. Thus, we have $q^m(\mu) \neq q^L(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{T_{-\beta}}([0,1]) \setminus \hat{\Psi}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_3))$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that

$$\mathcal{M}_{T_{-\beta}}([0,1])\setminus\hat{\Psi}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_3)) = \left\{a\delta_{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} + (1-a)\mu : 0 < a \leq 1, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{T_{-\beta}}((0,1])\right\}.$$

In particular, this set is not empty. Thus, we conclude that $q^m \neq q^L$.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16K17611.

References

[1] R. Bowen, Periodic points and measures for Axiom A diffeomorphisms, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **154** (1971), 377-397.
[2] Y. M. Chung. Large deviations on Markov towers. Nonlinearity **24** (2011), 1229–1252.
[3] Y. M. Chung and H. Takahasi. Large deviation principle for Benedicks-Carleson quadratic maps: Comm. Math. Phys. **315** (2012) 803–826. Math. Phys. 315 (2012) 803–826.
[4] V. Climenhaga and D. J. Thompson, Intrinsic ergodicity beyond specification: β-shifts, S-gap shifts, and their factors, Israel J. Math. **192** (2012), no. 2, 785-817.
[5] V. Climenhaga, D. Thompson and K. Yamamoto, Large deviations for systems with non-uniform structure, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.
[6] K. Dajani and S. D. Ramawadh, Symbolic dynamics of $(-\beta)$-expansions, J. Integer Seq. **15** (2012), no. 2, Article 12. 2. 6, 21.
[7] M. Dateyama, The almost weak specification property for ergodic group automorphisms of abelian groups, J. Math. Soc. Japan **42** (1990), no. 2, 341-351.
[8] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger and K. Sigmund, Ergodic Theory on Compact Spaces, Lecture Notes in Math., 527, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
[9] A. Eizenberg, Y. Kifer and B. Weiss, Large deviations for $\mathbb{Z}^d$-actions, Comm. Math. Phys. **164** (1994), 433-454.
[10] C. Frougny and A. C. Lai, On negative bases, Proceedings of DLT 09, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 5583, Springer, Berlin, 2009, pp. 252–263.

[11] S. Ito and T. Sadahiro, Beta-expansions with negative bases, Integers **9** (2009), A22, 239–259.
[12] D. Kwietniak, M. Lacka and P. Oprocha, A panorama of specification-like properties and their consequences, Dynamics and Numbers, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol. 669, 2016, 155-186.
[13] L. Liao and W. Steiner, Dynamical properties of the negative beta transformation, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **32** (2012), 1673-1690.
[14] B. Marcus, A note on periodic points for ergodic toral automorphisms, Monatsh. Math. **89** (1980), no. 2, 121-129.
[15] W. Parry, On the β-expansions of real numbers, Act Math. Hung. **11** (1960), 401-416.
[16] C.-E. Pfister and W.G. Sullivan, Large Deviations Estimates for Dynamical Systems without the Specification Property. Application to the β-shifts, Nonlinearity **18** (2005), 237-261.
[17] C.-E. Pfister and W. G. Sullivan, On the topological entropy of saturated sets, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **27** (2007), no. 3, 929-956.
[18] A. Renyi, Representations for real numbers and their ergodic properties, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **8** (1957), 477-493.
[19] C. Robinson, Dynamical systems. Stability, Symbolic Dynamics, and Chaos, 2nd Edition, CRC Press, London, 1999.
[20] Y. Takahashi, Entropy functional (free energy) for dynamical systems and their random perturbations. Stochastic analysis (Katata/Kyoto, 1982), North-Holland Math. Library 32, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 437–467 (1984).
[21] Daniel J. Thompson, Irregular sets, the β-transformation and the almost specification property, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012), no. 10, 5395-5414.
[22] P. Varandas, Non-uniform specification and large deviations for weak Gibbs measures, J. Stat. Phys. **146**, no. 2 (2012), 330-358.
[23] K. Yamamoto, On the weaker forms of the specification property and their applications, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), no. 11, 3807–3814.
[24] L.-S. Young, Some large deviation results for dynamical systems, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **318** (1990), no. 2, 525–543.

Department of General Education, Nagaoka University of Technology, Niigata 940-2188, JAPAN

E-mail address: k_yamamoto@vos.nagaokaut.ac.jp